

## 10.0 COMMENTS, COORDINATION, AND SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

### 10.1 OVERVIEW

Early coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is encouraged in the environmental review process in order to determine the scope of the environmental document, the level of analysis and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for the SR-22/ West Orange County Connection (SR-22/WOCC) have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods. These include project development team meetings, Steering Committee meetings, Elected Officials briefings, interagency coordination, public outreach program including print media and newsletters, open houses, and planned public hearings following the circulation of this document.

In fall 1997, the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) launched a two-year Major Investment Study and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement to determine the most feasible method to improve travel along SR-22 between SR-55 and the I-405 and I-605 interchange. The purpose of the Major Investment Study (MIS) was to evaluate alternatives for their ability to solve the transportation problems of the study area. In July 1997 the MIS for the project was initiated and a Steering Committee was formed to guide the development of the MIS. The MIS followed a three-part process prescribed by federal requirements. This process also included development of study goals, establishment of project alternatives to meet those goals and creation of evaluation criteria to allow comparison of the proposed alternatives.

The MIS process for this study area consisted of defining the transportation need, identifying a range of reasonable and feasible alternatives to meet that need, and conducting a screening-level alternatives evaluation to determine the alternatives to be studied further in the project development and environmental documentation phases. Impacts of these alternatives were further evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement (DEIR/EIS), and public and agency comments and responses to the DEIR/EIS have been documented in this Final Environmental document (FEIS/EIR). These project study goals were adopted by the Steering Committee on November 17, 1997 and by the OCTA Board on January 26, 1998.

The MIS process was initiated through development of several pieces of baseline information, which were then presented to the public through community workshops. Public input was gathered on the problems in the study area and public perception was assessed on the need for improvements. The next stage in the development of the MIS was the screening of alternatives against the evaluation criteria. The results of the analyses were included in the Final MIS Evaluation Report, which was submitted to OCTA and presented to the Peer Review Group, Steering Committee and the public.

This MIS Evaluation Report did not recommend alternatives for further engineering and environmental compliance, but rather presented the evaluation process and technical analysis results to the public and the SR-22/West Orange County Connection Steering Committee. It was also intended to facilitate informed input to the OCTA Board, who ultimately adopted alternatives for further engineering and environmental assessment, including the No Build Alternative, the TSM/Expanded Bus Service Alternative and the Full and Reduced Build alternatives.

With the completion of the MIS Evaluation Report, the study process began with implementation of the Project Study Report and the DEIR/EIS. After the DEIR/EIS was publicly circulated and two Public Hearings were held, the FEIS/EIR was prepared. To comply with NEPA, the FEIS/EIR has a 30-day public review/comments period. Following the public review/comment period for the FEIS/EIR, the Department, in conjunction with FHWA, will file a Notice of Determination (NOD), and FHWA will file a Record of Decision (ROD).

## 10.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AGENCIES

The SR-22/WOCC is subject to both NEPA and CEQA. The FHWA is the lead agency for the NEPA document (EIS) and the California Department of Transportation (Department) is the lead agency for the CEQA document (EIR). OCTA is a responsible agency under CEQA.

### 10.2.1 Agencies Contacted

More than 215 federal, state, and local agencies and officials were informed of the study initiation and to solicit comments. Agencies directly involved in the study include the following:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) FTA/FHWA – Metro-LA
- California Air Resources Board (CARB)
- California Department of Transportation District 12, Irvine
- California Highway Patrol (CHP), Westminster
- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
- County of Orange
- City of Cypress
- City of Garden Grove
- City of Los Alamitos
- Rossmore Community Services District
- City of Orange
- City of Santa Ana
- City of Seal Beach
- City of Stanton
- City of Westminster
- Garden Grove Unified School District
- Leisure World (City of Seal Beach)

### 10.2.2 Project Development Team

Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, consisting of California Department of Transportation District 12, OCTA and FHWA, were conducted periodically throughout the MIS/EIR/EIS process. In addition to these PDT meetings, OCTA has held regular Project Management Team (PMT) meetings to discuss project development issues, beginning in 1997 until January 2001, when the Department assumed the lead agency role. The PDT meetings continued from that date to the present. Individual team members also coordinated numerous special-purpose meetings to discuss specific issues.

### 10.2.3 Steering Committee

In July 1997, OCTA formed a Steering Committee consisting of agency representatives from affected local, state and federal agencies to help guide development of the study process. Steering Committee meetings were conducted on October 1, 1997; November 19, 1997; January 15, 1998; May 28, 1998; and July 14, 1998. See Appendix A in Volume II of the DEIR/EIS for the meeting agendas. Table 10.2-1 lists the members of the Steering Committee.

### 10.2.4 Elected Officials Coordination

As part of the Public Involvement Program two Elected Officials Breakfasts were conducted. The first breakfast meeting was held in December 1997 and the second in June 1998 at the Garden Grove Community Center. OCTA and Department staff met with city officials from the six impacted cities within the study area: Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana and Orange. At the first meeting,

OCTA and Department staff presented the proposed alternatives, provided an outline of the study process, and gathered initial input on specific city issues and concerns. At the second meeting, the draft evaluation report and technical analysis of proposed alternatives were presented and city comments were solicited.

#### **10.2.5 Consultation with Resource Agencies**

**A. U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFWS)**

As part of the coordination and consultation efforts, in June 2000 the Department contacted USFWS requesting information on sensitive/listed species that might occur within the limits of the SR-22/WOCC study area. The March 16, 2001 response letter from USFWS is provided in Appendix I (Volume IV) of the FEIS/EIR.

**B. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME (CDFG)**

As part of the coordination and consultation efforts, the Department contacted CDFG in June 2000, requesting information on sensitive/listed species that potentially occur within the SR-22/WOCC study area. The CDFG sensitive/listed species is in Appendix I (Volume IV) of the FEIS/EIR.

**C. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS (Corps)**

The Department, OCTA, and the SR-22/WOCC consultants have informally consulted with the Corps regarding permitting for the various project elements. Specifically, a draft NEPA/Section 404 Permit Process Determination Preliminary Information Package was prepared. The Department used this and supplemental information in discussions with the Corps and received a preliminary determination that the project would be consistent with existing nationwide Section 404 permits (Vega, 1999). The Section 404 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) process was not applied because of the anticipated applicability of a nationwide 404 permit. The July 26, 2000 Corps determination letter is provided in Appendix I (Volume IV) of the FEIS/EIR.

**D. CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD**

During the public review period of the DEIR/EIS, the California Air Resources Board was solicited for comments on the environmental document. Although not required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a letter was sent to CARB in accordance with Chapter 3, section 21104 (b) of the CEQA Statute: "the state lead agency shall consult with, and obtain comments from, the State Air Resources Board in preparing an environmental impact report on a highway or freeway project, as to the air pollution impact of the potential vehicular use of the highway or freeway." However, no comments were received from CARB on the SR-22/WOCC proposed project's DEIR/EIS.

**E. STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE**

The Department has provided the Historic Property Survey Report, Historic Architectural Survey Report and the Negative Archaeological Survey Report to FHWA for transmittal to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The Negative Archaeological Survey Report and the Historic Architectural Survey Report are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B of the Historic Property Survey Report, respectively. SHPO's conclusion on the HPSR and Determination of Effect Finding of Adverse Effect (DOE/FOE) documentation are as follows:

- SHPO concurs with FHWA's determination that the Full Build Alternative, with its proposed Pacific Electrical Arterial component, will have an adverse effect on the Pacific Electric/Santa Ana Bridge if selected as the preferred alternative;

- SHPO concurs that the Reduced Build Alternative, if selected as the preferred alternative, will have no effect on historic properties.

In the event that the Full Build Alternative had been identified as the preferred alternative, FHWA would have developed a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for review by SHPO in order to address the proposed project's effects on historic properties.

The SHPO letter to FHWA regarding their finding is attached as Appendix E in Volume II of the August 2001 DEIR/EIS.

As part of the (Enhanced) Reduced Build Alternative, a Supplemental Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) was conducted to ensure all of the properties identified in the FEIS/EIR are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The potential displacement of properties (residential and non-residential) will not be finalized until the approval of final design. The properties identified in the FEIS/EIR are preliminary and are subject to change. SHPO concurs that the (Enhanced) Reduced Build Alternative properties are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. See Appendix B (Volume IV) of the FEIS/EIR to review the SHPO concurrence letter. As discussed in Section 4.5, please note the properties at 12371 Pearce Street, 12346 Flagstone Place, and 12342 Flagstone Place listed in the Supplemental HASR are no longer considered as potential displacees. Pages 10-18 and 10-19 of this section will discuss in further detail the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing and the concerns that were raised by the potential displacees.

**Table 10.2-1  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Jeremy Farfan	Assembly District 71 Representative	Larry L. Rhinehart	Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ken Maddox	Assemblyman 68 <sup>th</sup> District	Bob Cady	FHWA
Don Gilchrist	Senatorial Representative	Dick Stillwell	Long Beach Transit
Loretta Donovan	Senatorial Representative	Roy Choi	Long Beach Transit
Chris Leo	State Assembly Representative	Eck Chaiboonma	MTA
Michele Morrissey	State Assembly Representative	Maureen Micheline	MTA
Adnan Maiah	California DOT, District 12	Cptn. Tom McCarthy	OCTA
Barbara Gossett/ Chris Flynn	California DOT, District 12	Jim Harmon	OCTA
Dale Ratzlaff	California DOT, District 12	Lt. Jay Leflore	OCTA
Gale Farber	California DOT, District 12	Randy Vannoy	OCTA
Javier Galindo	California DOT, District 12	Dana Wiemiller	OCTA
Jim Beil	California DOT, District 12	Dave Elbaum	OCTA
Judith Heyer	California DOT, District 12	Ellen Burton	OCTA
Ken Nelson	California DOT, District 12	Jose Solorio	OCTA
Leslie Manderscheid	California DOT, District 12	Kia Mortazavi	OCTA
Hamid Toossi	California DOT District 7	Paul Lanning	OCTA

Note: Composition of the Steering Committee has changed as the project has evolved. Not all names listed served on the Committee simultaneously.

**Table 10.2-1 (continued)**  
**STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Lt. Les Davis	CHP, Westminster	Ron Taira	OCTA
Sgt. Sherrell Sutherland	CHP, Westminster	Don Capelle	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Keith Carter	City of Cypress	Donna McCormick	Parsons Brinckerhoff
George Allen	City of Garden Grove	Steven Yoshizumi	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Jim Smith	City of Garden Grove	Amir Ilkhanipour	Public Facilities and Resources Department, County of Orange
Ed Shikada	City of Long Beach	Kenny Dang	Public Facilities and Resources Department, County of Orange
Mike Kim	City of Los Alamitos	Lance Natsuhara	Public Facilities and Resources Department, County of Orange
Hamid Bahadori	City of Orange	Russ Lightcap	Rossmoor Community Services
George Alvarez	City of Santa Ana	Evonne Sells	SCAQMD
Joyce Amerson	City of Santa Ana	Lupe Valdez	SCAQMD
Steve Badum	City of Seal Beach	Von Loveland	SCAQMD
Mike Kim	City of Stanton	Debra Redman	SCAQMD
Marwan Youssef	City of Westminster	Sandra Balmir	FTA/FHWA Metro-LA
Peter Mackprang	City of Westminster	Sgt. Jay Gentile	CHP, Santa Ana
Ken Smith	County of Orange	Rick Grebner	OCTA

### 10.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The Public Involvement Program (PIP) was designed to assess public opinion and solicit input in two phases, the Brainstorming and the Scoping. The Brainstorming Phase was implemented to preview issues and define alternatives for study and evaluation. The Scoping Phase focused on improvement alternatives and the effects and results of each alternative.

#### 10.3.1 Notification List

OCTA implemented an aggressive notification process to inform the potentially impacted communities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Orange, and unincorporated areas of Orange County along the SR-22 about the project study. A list of individuals and organizations presumed to have a significant interest in the study was assembled to serve as the basic mailing list for the initial public workshops conducted in December 1997. This list was created in cooperation with each of the cities located contiguous to the project site. Staff representing each city were contacted by OCTA and asked to submit lists of key community groups, civic organizations, elected and appointed officials, churches, neighborhood associations, social service groups, businesses and employers, public hearing notice or city council agenda recipients, and any other interested parties. These lists were supplemented by several thousand names drawn from the existing OCTA database, including chambers of commerce; individuals who have attended OCTA-sponsored public meetings; ethnic and minority organizations; social service and paratransit providers; local, state, and federal officials and resource agencies; recipients of the OCTA agendas, newsletters and other publications; schools and educators; major employers; media outlets; etc. This entire OCTA database was analyzed and all addresses located within the zip codes contiguous to the project area were sorted out to create an interested parties universe.

#### 10.3.2 Public Workshops

The Brainstorming Phase of the PIP involved three Public Workshops held in December 1997 at the following locations and times:

- Garden Grove Community Center on Tuesday, December 9, 1997
- OCTA office in Orange on Wednesday, December 10, 1997
- Los Alamitos Community Center on Thursday, December 11, 1997

The workshops were held to gain initial input regarding the proposed alternatives, to preview the issues, and to define the public concern regarding noise due to lack of noise barriers in key areas. They included a brief presentation and a facilitated discussion of the transportation alternatives considered for the study. Participants were asked to complete a survey at the conclusion of the workshop and to include any additional comments. The three Public Workshops yielded a preliminary set of alternatives.

To publicize the study and workshops and to permit people to provide input through the mail, fax or internet, project materials were distributed to 20,000 households within the project area, notices were sent to public agencies and local governments, multilingual newspaper ads were placed, surveys reaching 160,000 readers were printed, press releases were sent and public service announcements made, and project information and surveys were placed on the OCTA website, as well as articles in OCTA monthly newsletters.

#### Survey and Discussion Results of 1997 Public Workshops

Of the more than 125 people who attended the workshops, 100 completed surveys. Participants also submitted numerous explanatory comments to the open-ended questions and 11 people returned the newspaper survey.

Survey results from the three workshops showed that residents preferred the addition of general-purpose lanes and supported implementation of HOV connectors in conjunction with HOV lanes. The least preferred alternative was the No Build option. Participants were also asked to select the most important evaluation

criteria. Participants in Garden Grove and Los Alamitos listed right-of-way acquisition most frequently, followed by air quality and noise. Participants in Orange felt that safety was the top evaluation criterion, followed by air quality and cost-effectiveness. Preferred communication methods varied between the workshops. The most popular method was direct mail and surveys, followed by public workshops.

During the discussion period, workshop participants expressed similar concerns and suggested other alternatives as a solution. These alternatives included:

- Signal synchronization on parallel arterial streets
- Installing electric signage on SR-22 to monitor traffic conditions
- Building soundwalls
- Implementing the Smart Street program
- Building a fixed guideway transit line along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way
- Making the former Pacific Electric right-of-way an arterial for HOVs only

### **Public Opinion Polls**

Independent of the SR-22/West Orange County Connection MIS, three professionally conducted quantitative public opinions polls were taken to evaluate the different alternatives:

- Vision 2020 in July 1996
- Rail Study poll in May 1997
- SR-91 HOT Lanes poll in May 1997

These polls were administered to 600 high-propensity registered voters throughout Orange County. In each poll respondents were read a question and then asked to indicate how they felt about the statement. Response choices were: strongly approve, somewhat approve, somewhat disapprove, strongly disapprove, or no opinion.

Poll results showed general support for HOV lanes and environmental policies. The polls indicated that Orange County voters placed a high priority on improving existing roads as opposed to building new roads and that improvements to the SR-22 were important. There was also support for preserving the former Pacific Electric right-of-way for future transportation uses, but should not be included in this study.

### **Results of 1998 Open House/Public Scoping Meeting**

The public viewed the study as separate sub-projects with varying levels of importance. The mainline SR-22 was the top priority for improvements with minimal support for any type of improvement along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. Alternative 4, General-Purpose Lanes, was the first choice among improvement alternatives, followed by HOV alternatives. If HOV lanes were constructed on the mainline, the public strongly supported HOV connectors at major interchanges within the project area. Noise, safety and right-of-way concerns were also brought up during the meeting.

Top priorities included:

- Reducing congestion during peak commute hours
- Minimizing air quality impacts
- Safety
- Moving people efficiently

Much like the three December 1997 community workshops, survey results indicated minimal support for Alternative 1 (No Build), Alternative 2 (TSM), and Alternative 3 (Fixed Guideway).

### **10.3.3 NEPA/CEQA Notifications**

#### **A. NOTIFICATION OF INITIATION OF STUDIES**

The Notification of Initiation of Studies (NOIS) is a letter required by the Department that is prepared to inform other agencies that the Department and, in this case, OCTA, were formally initiating stud-

ies related to a highway project. It briefly described the proposed project and outlined the documents to be prepared.

The NOIS for the SR-22/WOCC was sent on May 1, 1998, to City Councils, Boards of Supervisors and affected state, federal, regional and municipal agencies and other interested parties (Appendix A, Volume II). It superseded a previous NOIS sent in the fall of 1997 to clarify the alternatives being considered based on the December 1997 workshops. It also announced a Scoping Meeting for the project.

#### B. NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) is a CEQA-required document that is drafted if the lead agency determines that an EIR is required. The NOP and environmental significance checklist are mailed to federal and trustee agencies responsible for approval, funding and natural resources affected by the project. The NOP must include:

- A description of the project
- Location of the project on an attached map or by street address in an urbanized area
- Possible environmental effects of the project
- Specific reference to and solicitation of agencies' views on potential impacts to historical properties.

The NOP and the checklist must be sent together by certified mail or any other method that provides a record that the notice was received. Within 30 days of receiving the NOP, responsible agencies shall provide comments on the scope and content of the document, including possible alternatives and mitigation measures. If, after 30 days, a responsible agency does not respond with comments or a request for additional time, it is concluded that they have no comments (Section 15082, CEQA Handbook, 1994). A copy of the NOP was also sent to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research.

An NOP for the SR-22/WOCC was sent on May 29, 1998 to more than 215 federal, state and local agencies and officials to inform them of study initiation and to solicit comments (Appendix A, Volumes II and III).

#### C. NOTICE OF INTENT

NEPA requires that if a project includes federal involvement, the EPA must publish the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register*. This letter solicits federal agencies' comments and suggestions for the required EIS.

The NOI for SR-22/WOCC was published on Wednesday, June 3, 1998 in the *Federal Register*, Volume 63, Number 106, pages 30284 and 30285 (Appendix A, Volume II).

#### D. NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

Since this project document is a joint NEPA/CEQA document, the EPA must publish the Notice of Availability (NOA) in the *Federal Register*. This Notice solicits federal agencies' comments and suggestions for the required EIS.

The NOA for the SR-22/WOCC project was published on September 7, 2001 in the *Federal Register*, Volume 66, Number 174, page 46792 (Appendix E).

An overview of the comments received can be found in Section 10.5.4 of this chapter.

### 10.3.4 Scoping Meetings



In the spring of 1998, the Scoping Phase was launched to evaluate the six proposed alternatives and to address noise barrier issues. As part of this phase, one Public Scoping Meeting was held on June 23, 1998 at the Garden Grove Community Center. A separate meeting was also held at the same time and location to address noise barrier issues. To advertise the Scoping Meeting and gain additional input, two direct mail surveys were sent to residents and businesses in the area and a survey requesting input was listed on OCTA's website. Full-page ads were printed in the *Community Close-Up* (a local newspaper in central Orange County) and *Excelsior* (a Spanish-language newspaper) on June 18 and 19, 1998. The Scoping Meeting was also announced in the NOIS and NOI.

The format of the Scoping Meeting consisted of a self-paced exhibit with technical staff available to answer questions. A comprehensive survey was distributed at the meetings, requesting participants to comment on suggested freeway improvements, alternative proposals, and issues that should be addressed in evaluating the proposed alternatives. Respondents could add any comments they had regarding improvements to the mobility of SR-22.

### **10.3.5 Direct Mail Campaign**

In December 1997, upon completion of the mailing list, a direct mail notice went to 10,000 residents within the study area in order to publicize the study and permit people to provide input. In June 1998, a project newsletter was distributed to 18,500 residents and businesses within one-eighth mile of the study area and 5,000 absentee property owners within one-quarter mile of the study area to advertise the Public Scoping Meetings and allow for public input (Appendix A, Volume II). In addition, project newsletters were distributed to more than 400 residents and officials on the mailing database in June 1999 and February 2000.

### **10.3.6 Print Media Campaign**

On November 28, and 29, 1997, half page ads were printed in the local newspapers, the *Los Alamitos Enterprise*, the *Community Close-Up*, and the *Orange County News*, informing residents and business owners of workshops locations (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS). A total of 159,044 readers were reached via newspaper ads. A front-page story was also printed in the *Orange County Register*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Los Alamitos Enterprise*. In order to reach multi-cultural populations in the affected area, a Spanish language ad was printed in the *Excelsior* newspaper and Vietnamese Public Service Announcements were aired on Little Saigon Radio. In June 1998, information regarding the Public Scoping Meetings was delivered through full-page ads in local and Spanish language newspapers, as well as public service announcements on Vietnamese radio.

### **10.3.7 OCTA Board Meetings**

On September 8, 1997, the OCTA Board voted to expand the scope of the SR-22 project to include: I-405 between SR-22 and I-605; I-605 between I-405 and Katella Avenue; and the former Pacific Electric right-of-way between SR-22 and Bristol Street. The name of the project was subsequently changed to SR-22/West Orange County Connection.

On January 26, 1998, OCTA held a Board meeting at the County of Orange Planning Commission Hearing Room, Hall of Administration, 10 Civic Center Plaza. OCTA presented a summary of the public input from the community workshops on the project, including study goals, transportation alternatives and potential evaluation criteria. The Board concurred with the development of the study up to that date and approved further evaluation of improvements for the study area.

On August 10, 1998, OCTA held a Board meeting at the County of Orange Planning Commission Hearing Room. OCTA staff requested that the Board authorize them to proceed with the environmental compliance process and the preliminary engineering of a build alternative. The Board unanimously agreed to proceed with the preparation of the draft environmental document and begin preliminary engineering of two alterna-

tives (Alternative 4B, General-Purpose Lanes, and Alternative 6C, HOV Lanes Full System) from the State Route 22/West County Connection Major Investment Study.

On November 2, 1998, OCTA staff presented a proposal to the OCTA Board's Executive Committee to add a general-purpose lane alternative as part of the environmental review and preliminary engineering for the State Route 22/West Orange County Connection project. In addition, staff presented a proposal from SCAG to conduct a two-phase regional HOV system performance study. The Executive Committee recommended against these proposals based on concerns regarding the overall costs, timing and other factors associated with the proposed studies. On November 9, 1998, the OCTA Board confirmed the Executive Committee's recommendation and voted not to pursue a general-purpose lane alternative in the environmental document and preliminary engineering for the project. The Board also voted to defer Phase I of SCAG's HOV system performance study until Orange County's HOV system is completed, yet decided to support Phase II of SCAG's regional study as part of their Overall Work Program.

On April 26, 1999, the OCTA Board expanded the project scope of work to include improvements at The City Drive and SR-22. The OCTA Board again took action on January 24, 2000, when a Reduced Build Alternative was added to the environmental document and preliminary engineering due to higher than anticipated environmental impacts associated with the Full Build Alternative.

#### 10.4 ISSUES IDENTIFIED

The PIP provided residents, business owners and city officials with the opportunity to voice concerns and identify issues regarding development of the study. Survey results from the three public workshops and the open house/public scoping meeting showed that residents were most concerned with right-of-way acquisitions and noise impacts. This was followed by safety, air quality and cost issues. The *SR-22/West Orange County Connection Major Investment Study Public Workshop Report* (March 1998) (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS) outlines the results and issues identified during the public involvement program.

Responses to the NOIS, NOP and NOI, and comments received in public meetings are summarized below.

##### 10.4.1 Responses to NOIS, NOP and NOI

###### Southern California Gas Company:

- Requested that "signed" final plans and subsequent revisions be sent to them as soon as possible. A minimum of 12 weeks is required to analyze the plans and design alterations due to conflicting facilities. Upon request, at least two days prior to the start of construction, the Gas Company will mark underground facilities at no cost. No special permits are needed other than what the cities require.

###### City of Seal Beach:

- The study indicates that impacts to prime farmlands are expected to be less than significant. According to Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Handbook, a project will have a significant impact if it would convert "prime" agricultural lands to non-agricultural use, or impair the agricultural productivity of "prime" agricultural land.
- The City asks that the air quality analysis include a study of carbon monoxide "hotspots" at adjacent freeway on/off ramp locations. They also request that mitigation measures be developed to reduce the impacts to an insignificant level.
- Recreation - page 28 section XV. This section should reflect that the existing Towne Center (adjacent to I-405) is undergoing the application process to dedicate the Bixby Old Ranch Tennis Club to the City as a public recreation center.
- There is improvement project for the bridge widening at Seal Beach Boulevard. Some alternatives may affect this portion of the project area. Brown also commented on the effects of the right-of-way acquisition to the College Park East neighborhood, located north of I-405 between Seal Beach

Boulevard and Valley View Street. He feels that any further encroachment into this residential area would be detrimental to the neighborhood and to the City of Seal Beach.

California Department of Transportation (District 12):

- Recommended that the OCTA Board carry forward the concept of Alternative 6C as an alternative to be evaluated in the environmental process.

County of Orange:

- The unincorporated residential neighborhood of Rossmoor will be significantly impacted.
- The Koll Company, the developer of the Bolsa Chica area, is required as a mitigation element to widen the Bolsa Chica Street (Valley View Street) bridge at I405 and SR-22. They are also required to widen the arterial highways and improve intersections in the area.
- The Draft EIR/EIS should address the trails and bikeways. Any detours should be coordinated with the County and local jurisdictions.
- The Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) facilities are incapable of handling the 100-year discharge at the freeway crossings.
- Permits from the County's Public Facilities and Resources Department are required for any work within the OCFCD right-of-way.
- The project will need to address the reconstruction of the debris walls, etc., upstream of the Santa Ana River and Santiago Creek, as well as any reconstruction of channel slopes.
- The Army Corps of Engineers must approve improvements impacting the Santa Ana River. This is separate from the Corps' 404 permit. The County Property Permit Section of the Public Facilities and Resources Department will submit the plans to the Corps for approval on behalf of OCTA, FHWA and the Department.
- Required grading for the improvements would impact two closed landfills: La Veta located near the corner of La Veta Avenue and Tustin Street, and Yorba located near the corner of Chapman Avenue and Yorba Street. The DEIR/EIS should address how disturbances to these landfills will be consulted with the appropriate agencies.

City of Santa Ana:

Requested that noise measurements be taken at sensitive receptor sites for each alternative. Mitigation measures should also be added to reduce the noise impacts to acceptable day-time and night-time levels. There is also the potential for archeological sites in the area.

City of Long Beach:

Regarding Alternative 3, Fixed Guideway, unavoidable impacts would occur to:

- Aesthetics
- Public service
- Cultural resources
- Noise
- Land use incompatibility
- Transportation
- Environmental justice

City of Garden Grove:

Supported HOV lanes, but strongly opposed direct, high-speed, flyover connectors to an arterial on the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. The city was concerned with the following areas of impact:

- Potential economic loss
- Visual impacts
- Potential problems with traffic circulation

The taking of properties near Trask Avenue, resulting result in a loss of sales and property tax revenue. The benefits to the City of Garden Grove would not outweigh these economic losses.

- There are three projects currently under consideration within the project study area. The first is the Garden Grove Auto Center Expansion, currently located on the south side of Trask Avenue, east of Brookhurst Street. The 3.2-acre expansion, currently in the planning stage, is located south of Trask Avenue, between Brookhurst Street and Taft Street. The second project is the addition of Garden Grove freeway signs at the Mobile Home Park (70 feet high), in the OCTA right-of-way (130 feet high) and at the Auto Center (70 feet high). The third project is a 3,737 square foot proposed car wash building in the OCTA right-of-way between Harbor Boulevard and Westminster Avenue. Historic structures include a Eucalyptus Vat on Trask Avenue at Taft Street, and the Robinson House at 10342 Central Avenue.

California Department of Fish and Game:

Suggested that the following information be included in the environmental documents:

- A complete assessment of the flora and fauna within the project study area, emphasizing endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats.
- Discuss direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources with measures to offset impacts.
- Analyze alternatives that avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be analyzed in areas with lower resource sensitivity.
- A CESA permit is required when there is the potential that a project will take an endangered species or plant. Early consultation is requested because modification to the project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA permit.
- All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent or perennial, must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks. These setbacks must preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to the on-site and off-site wildlife populations.

U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife:

Requests that the following information be analyzed in the environmental documents:

- A complete description of the project and practical alternatives that reduce impacts to the sensitive habitats and endangered, threatened or sensitive species.
- Qualitative and quantitative assessments of the biological resources and habitat types that will be impacted by the project.
- Assessment of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of all steps of the project (construction, implementation, operation, and maintenance) to fish and wildlife. Growth inducing effects of the project should also be discussed.
- The DEIR/EIS should discuss the measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands. Wetlands should be delineated using the methodology set forth in the Corps' *Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory, 1987).<sup>1</sup>

City of Long Beach:

Commented that there were no major impacts to his jurisdiction at the time.

City of Orange:

Commented on two properties undergoing redevelopment and two historic properties. The first property undergoing construction is the Town and Country Shopping Center located on the south side of the freeway, east of Main Street. It will be rebuilt as a retail center with approximately the same square footage as the current use. The second is The City Shopping Center located on the north side of the freeway between the City Drive and Lewis Street. It has been demolished and rebuilt as an entertainment/shopping center. The first historic property in the area is Old Town Orange. It was recently added to the Federal Register and therefore has been the subject of improvement proposals. The second historic property is Hart Park, located on the east side of Glassell Street and north of the freeway. Hart Park is the oldest of the city's neighborhood parks. The portion adjacent to the freeway was developed

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at the Department of Transportation, District 12.

and added to the park in the mid-1970s. Part of the park at the corner of Glassell Street and SR-22 was developed into an orange grove as a perpetual exhibit of the city's agricultural history.

#### 10.4.2 Public Workshops

##### A. PUBLIC COMMENT QUALITATIVE RESULTS

The following characterizes inputs received from all sources.

- There was a general consensus that there is a current congestion problem along the SR-22 that should be addressed.
- The vast majority of participants believed additional transportation improvements were necessary. This was supported by the fact that the “no build” alternative had little to no support.
- The most frequently voiced concern related to the lack of existing noise barriers and the manner in which they would be provided in the future.
- There were concerns about whether property would be taken if SR-22 was expanded and the impacts of any expansion to those living adjacent to the SR-22.
- Other concerns were expressed about the impacts to nearby intersections, public safety and health.
- There was broad consensus that several of the current access ramps to the SR-22 are dangerous and cause congestion. Most people believed that all the ramps needed to be included in the study.
- There was a broad consensus that if a rail system was built it must be supported by a feeder system.
- Some people recommended improved public notification for future meetings.

At the meetings, most people were satisfied with the range of the alternatives proposed for the study. Several people commented that the “No Build” alternative was not an option considering the growth in Orange County and some individuals opposed the HOV option. Many encouraged OCTA to initially look at studying the addition of two or more lanes in each direction on the SR-22 regardless of the right-of-way concerns. The general consensus was to initially look at all factors and to “think big.” Several people felt the need to transition to and from HOV lanes in order to access exits causes dangerous conditions and accidents. A few individuals argued HOV lanes were not efficient and should not be considered.

People had mixed opinions about the potential use of the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. Some suggested converting the former Pacific Electric right-of-way to an HOV-only use. A few people favored the idea of an elevated rail system along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way with open space underneath. When the issue of rail was discussed, most people agreed that residents in Orange County need an alternative to their cars, but cautioned that rail would be ineffective if supporting bus feeder systems were not in place.

There were few comments regarding the TSM/Expanded Bus Service Alternative. One person commented that “these types of improvements don’t cost anything so why aren’t they already being implemented?”

There was some reference to the Century Freeway project at each of the meetings. The general consensus was OCTA should not “make this another Century Freeway project.”

At each meeting there was minimal interest in SCAG’s role in the regional transportation planning process. Members of Drivers For Highway Safety, a freeway advocacy group, requested that OCTA clarify whether SCAG would require HOV lanes on SR-22 and encouraged OCTA to involve a SCAG representative in the process.

##### B. GARDEN GROVE/LOS ALAMITOS MEETINGS, DECEMBER 9 AND 11, 1997

Residents and the public who attended the Los Alamitos and Garden Grove public workshops had the following comments and concerns.

- Concerns regarding the specific impacts to their properties, immediate area, and right-of-way issues.
- OCTA needs a more thorough notification process. A suggestion was made to use the city water bills.
- Concerns regarding the long-term failure of the Department to provide noise barriers to shield the residential area near Anthony Avenue. The noise barrier issue should be resolved and existing noise mitigated before any new improvements are implemented. Erecting noise barriers would help improve safety and public health in their neighborhoods. Noise barriers would help eliminate drive-by shootings in the area.
- Concerns regarding homeless people entering private property.
- Concerns regarding rats and trash on their properties.
- Concerns regarding property takes, adequate compensation for the current market value of their homes, and the property valuation and compensation process.

C. OCTA, ORANGE MEETING, DECEMBER 10, 1997

Residents and the public who attended the Orange Public Workshop had the following comments and concerns.

- Concerns about congestion and moving traffic throughout the entire project area.
- Comments regarding the need for all ramps and transitions to be evaluated for safety. Ramp safety should be a goal of the study.
- Issues of funding, funding sources, priorities, and how OCTA was communicating its priorities to state and federal officials.

D. SURVEY RESULTS

Workshop attendees and newspaper survey respondents were asked during the scoping meetings in 1998 (see above) to list the biggest traffic problems throughout the study area on their surveys. The problem areas varied based on the respondents' neighborhood and commute patterns. The participants' comments and survey results are listed below:

- Existing southbound SR-57 to the westbound SR-22 connector: A Bottleneck exists because the lanes merge into one lane at Bristol Street and Memory Lane. This causes a backup to Haster Street in Garden Grove.
- The westbound SR-22 on-ramp at Haster Street is very dangerous (more dangerous than it has been in 12 years).
- The City Drive exit is unsafe. The exit needs to be moved west of the current location or a bridge needs to be built over it because it is too tight of a connection. There is a business with 800 employees located at this exit and they cannot get off the SR-22 to get to work. "To help these employees, send a newsletter to the businesses and their employees regarding the status and safety issue at the City Drive ramp."
- SR-55 and Bristol Street ramp is unsafe. All the ramps along the SR-22 are unsafe. The surface streets are all congested due to the unsafe ramp problems.
- There is a 180-degree turn at the Orange Crush and the SR-57 transition, which is dangerous. The bridge is too small and dangerous – this entire area is a hazard. It needs a direct connector.
- The noise barriers were erected in the wrong areas according to residents in the Los Alamitos area. Noise barriers were erected at Beach Boulevard and Magnolia Avenue and Knott Street and Valley View Street, but not where they are needed.
- If this project goes through there will be no room for the expansion and reconfiguration of the ramps that would be necessary to handle the expansion of the bridge and access to the local

roadways and freeways. There are two other proposed developments in the area that would generate additional traffic, thus impacting that ramp area.

- All connectors to and from the freeways at either end of the SR-22 are currently causing great congestion problems.

Specific problem areas listed by workshop survey respondents included:

Los Alamitos.

- Interchange between Los Alamitos Boulevard and Valley View Street
- Orange Crush at The City Drive
- I-405/SR-22 northbound transition
- SR-22/I-405 interchange (several people listed this)
- Freeway-to-freeway interchanges at the SR-22 and the I-405, I-605, and I-710 (outside study area)
- Bridge widening at Seal Beach Boulevard and the SR-22/I-405 (several similar comments)
- I-405/ I-605 transition
- Seal Beach Boulevard and Lampson Avenue
- Ramp at Seal Beach Boulevard and I-405
- SR-22 eastbound approaching the Orange Crush
- SR-22 westbound approaching the I-405
- SR-22 at Beach Boulevard
- SR-22 and SR-55 interchange (several similar comments)
- Springdale Street overpass
- SR-22 between the SR-55 and Harbor Boulevard
- Brookhurst Avenue
- SR-22/SR-57 interchange
- SR-22 between Beach Boulevard and Harbor Boulevard
- SR-22 between Magnolia Avenue and I-5

Garden Grove.

- Orange Crush (a few people listed this)
- SR-22 throughout all of Garden Grove
- SR-22 between Seal Beach Blvd. and SR-55
- SR22/SR-57 interchange
- Magnolia westbound
- Congestion on all ramps
- SR-22 east between Brookhurst and SR-55 (several similar comments)
- SR-22 west to I-405
- SR-22 westbound slowing at Harbor Boulevard

Orange.

- Freeway to freeway interchanges at I-405/I-605, SR-22/I-405, and SR-22/I-5/SR-57 (several similar comments)
- Orange Crush
- All on- and off-ramps use old technology, which causes slowing
- SR-22 at the Orange Crush
- Southbound SR-57 to SR-22 connector
- Lack of signal synchronization

Problem areas listed by newspaper survey respondents.

- Vehicle stoppages on SR-22 at the I-405, I-605, and I-710
- List speed limits in the lanes so that speeds are maintained; ensure that the left lane is used for passing only

- Ban buses, trucks, and government vehicles (except police)
- Improved on- and off-ramps along the entire SR-22
- Eliminate meters at the on-ramps along the entire SR-22
- Eastbound SR-22 at I-405 from Seal Beach Boulevard; backs up two to three lights during peak hours
- Repair the crack on the SR-22 near Neptune Court, west of Newhope Street
- Orange Crush congestion at peak hours; construction will make this problem worse
- SR-22 interchange at the SR-57 and I-5
- Off-ramp at The City Drive
- Interchanges at SR-22 eastbound and I-5 southbound
- Bristol Street exit ramp causes back ups on the entire SR-22
- SR-57 southbound to SR-22 westbound
- Interchange at SR-22 and I-405 between Valley View Street and I-405 at I-605
- Need noise barriers on the north side of the SR-22 between Knott Street and Valley View Street

#### **10.4.3 Scoping Meetings, 1998:**

The following issues were raised by members of the public at the Scoping Meetings in 1998:

- Soundwalls do not extend far enough. Will current noise studies be transferred into the new SR-22 project?
- An industrial area in Garden Grove has a soundwall, although some homes do not. Noise readings need to be taken during the noisiest time of day. Trucks downshifting pose a problem, especially at night. Could the "No build" alternative be the preferred one?
- Residents on Anthony Street had been promised a soundwall, but none had been built yet. The notification process needs to be improved; many residents of that street had not received notice of the meetings.
- Residents questioned why a soundwall in an industrial area (Knott Avenue and Springdale Street) had a higher priority for construction than residential uses. Why can't the Department use existing sound studies? Freeway noise near the car dealerships is worse since landscaping was removed. Did the dealerships pay the Department to remove it to improve their visibility? Is removal of the car dealerships an alternative?

#### **10.4.4 Elected Officials Meetings**

Meetings were held in December 1997 and June 1998. The elected officials had concerns regarding:

- Right-of-way takes in their cities
- Funding for the project, specifically the use of Measure M
- Sound walls and noise mitigation
- Other possible alternatives



## 10.5 NEPA/CEQA SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

### 10.5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Transportation (the Department), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), has coordinated its planning efforts with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested citizens and concerned organizations. The Department assumed the lead role from OCTA for the environmental documentation in January 2001. The Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (DEIR/EIS) was released for public review/comments in August 2001.

### 10.5.2 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM MEMBERS

The Project Development Team (PDT) functions as a formal interdisciplinary team steering the course of studies. The PDT directs and participates in the planning, development and evaluation of alternatives, and participates in major meetings, public hearings and other community interaction processes. The PDT for the State Route-22 (SR-22) is made up of the following agencies/individuals:

For the Department of Transportation:

Adnan Maiah, Project Management	Tam Nguyen, Design
Leslie Manderscheid, Environmental Planning	Kathy Anderson, Right-of-Way
Dan Phu, Environmental Planning	Isaac Alonso Rice, Design
Loanna Huyhn, Design	Camilo Rocha, Design
Reza Aurasteh, Environmental Engineering	Ken Bui, Construction
Wayne Chiou, Environmental Engineering	Jeff Ayer, Structures
Saied Hashemi, Traffic Operations (north)	Carol Roland, HQs
Gamini Weeratunga, Traffic Operation (north)	Susanne Glasgow, HQs
Sandy Ankhasirisan, Landscape Architect	

For the Federal Highway Administration:

Robert Cady, Transportation Engineer	Mary Ann Rondinella, Environmental Planning
Stephanie Stoermer, Environmental Planning	
Katie Ann Wong-Murillo, Western Resources Center	

For the Orange County Transportation Authority:

Ellen Burton, Project Management	John Garcia, Project Management
Richard Teano, Advance Transportation Planning	

### 10.5.3 Agencies/Public Involvement Process

On August 29, 2001, public entities and governmental agencies were notified of the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (DEIR/EIS). The Cities of Cypress, Garden Grove, Orange, Santa Ana, Seal Beach, Tustin, Westminster, as well as the County of Orange and the Rossmore Community Services District, each received two copies of the DEIR/EIS. One copy was for the City or governmental entity's governing body and the other was reserved for its constituents to solicit comments/feedbacks on the proposed SR-22/WOCC proposed project. The release of the DEIR/EIS for public review/comment period was between August 31, 2001 and October 30, 2001. A joint DEIR/EIS is typically required to have a public review period of at least 45 days. However, the Department and its partnering agency, the OCTA, recognized widespread public interests in the project and extended the public review period to 65 days (See Appendix E in Volume IV of this FEIS/EIR for copies of the letters to the previously referenced governmental entities).

A Notice of Availability (NOA) was issued to notify the public that the DEIR/EIS was available for review/comment. The NOA for the DEIR/EIS was placed in four newspapers. These included advertisements in multiple languages in an attempt to reach the broadest groups of concerned citizens/stakeholders. The NOA notification was placed in the August 29<sup>th</sup>, September 20<sup>th</sup>, and September 24<sup>th</sup> sections of the following newspapers: the *Excelsior* (Spanish), *Nguoi Viet* (Vietnamese), the *Orange County Register*, and the

*Los Angeles Times* (Orange County Edition). The Department and OCTA posted the NOA and the public hearings on their websites. The Department's website also provided information including the DEIR/EIS in an Adobe Acrobat Reader (pdf) format and the public comments form (See Appendix D in Volume IV of this FEIS/EIR for copies of the notices).

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR/EIS was published on September 7, 2001 in the *Federal Register*, Volume 66, Number 174, page 46792 (Appendix E).

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the DEIR/EIS was submitted through the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research. The State Clearinghouse received fifteen copies of the DEIR/EIS as well as the NOA and notice of public hearings for distribution to State agencies. They included the following State agencies: the Department of Fish and Game, Office of Historic Preservation, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Highway Patrol, the Department of Transportation District 7, the Department of Transportation (headquarters), Housing and Community Development, the Air Resources Board, SWQCB: Water Quality, Regional WQCB # 9 (Santa Ana), Native American Heritage Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. In addition to the State Clearinghouse's distribution list, the Department also sent copies of the DEIR/EIS to the United States Department of the Navy, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the FHWA.

The DEIR/EIS was also available at the following libraries: Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Rossmoor/Seal Beach, Mary Wilson Library (Seal Beach), the Orange City Library; and the Department's District 12 and Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) offices. FHWA placed the notice of availability of the DEIR/EIS in the Federal Register on September 10, 2001.

Two public hearings were held to allow the public to review and learn more about the proposed project. These hearings were placed in the previously mentioned newspaper advertisements as well as the Department and OCTA websites. A September 26, 2001 public hearing was held at the Garden Grove Community Center, followed by an October 3, 2001 public hearing at the OCTA's meeting room. Enlarged plans, technical reports, and an informational package along with the comments form were made available at the public hearings.

In addition to the notifications of the DEIR/EIS in the newspapers and the Department and OCTA websites, a mailer was sent to potentially affected residents and commercial properties along the SR-22 project limits. On approximately October 19, 2001, a "Reminder Notice" was sent to all of the potentially affected residential and commercial properties listed in the DEIR/EIS, concerned citizens/stakeholders requesting information on the project, and numerous residents in the unincorporated community of Rossmoor. There were numerous residents in Rossmoor (County of Orange unincorporated) with concerns regarding the proposed project element on the western terminus. These included many residents who reside along Martha Ann Drive and Yellowtail.

On November 6, 2001, approximately one week after the close of the public comment/review period for the SR-22/WOCC proposed project, a postcard was sent to all of the concerned citizen/stakeholders and agencies who commented on the DEIR/EIS during the public review/comment period (August 31<sup>st</sup> – October 30<sup>th</sup>). The Department received approximately 1,100 total comments (~550 non-duplicative comments). Comments were received from residents from the Rossmoor/Los Alamitos communities and the Cities of Seal Beach and Garden Grove primarily, as well as from Long Beach, Anaheim, Santa Ana and the City of Orange.

### **Pearce Street Pedestrian Overcrossing**

As discussed in Section 2 of this FEIS/EIR, refined engineering plans and the availability of more detailed design level surveys have identified that the Pearce Pedestrian overcrossing is in need of replacement since

it would conflict with the proposed widening of the SR-22/WOCC project. The original Preliminary Engineering plans for the SR-22/WOCC pedestrian overcrossing assumed it would be replacement in kind. The Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing is located between the Fairview Street and Harbor Boulevard exits on SR-22, just east of Harbor Boulevard. The Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing is an existing pedestrian overcrossing that is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The replacement of the pedestrian overcrossing would have to comply ADA standards. ADA requires a minimum of 8.3% grade, and an eight-foot width for the walkway of the pedestrian overcrossing. The existing Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing is approximately at a 15% grade and it is approximately seven feet wide. The refined engineering plans also allowed determination of the proximity of setback for possible landscaping and determination of preliminary noise barriers. The plans for the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing will be finalized at the design stage of the project. In order to determine the usage of the Pearce Street, surveys were sent to residents within a half-mile radius of the pedestrian overcrossing.

During the administrative review phase of the FEIS/EIR, the proposed ADA compliant pedestrian overcrossing identified three residential displacements that were not previously identified during the DEIR/EIS phase. As part of the environmental documentation process, the Department's right-of-way staff contacted these three potential displacees. This led to concerns raised by the displacees, and the Department elected to survey the usage of the pedestrian overcrossing and hold a public meeting. A Public Meeting was held on December 17, 2002 to present to the community the different plans to replace the existing Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing. The purpose of the Public Meeting was to supplement the survey by sharing information with the community and to solicit their input on the replacement of the pedestrian overcrossing. Approximately 50 residents in the community attended the meeting. Comment Forms were available at the meeting and 42 of them were received. The summary of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing survey results, as well as the Public Meeting, and the Comment Form are discussed in Section 2.2 (A).

### **Summary of Pearce Street Pedestrian Survey**

On December 4, 2002, 2389 surveys were sent to residents within a half-mile radius of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing. The survey was available in English and Spanish, and was sent out by a mailing services company. Upon discovering that the mailing services company inadvertently omitted the Bahia Village Mobilehome Park (less than ¼ mile away from pedestrian overcrossing), 177 additional surveys were hand-carried to this mobilehome park.

The questions in the survey solicited information such as whether the respondent uses the pedestrian overcrossing, their purpose for using it, their age, their destination, and if they would have other means of transportation if the pedestrian overcrossing were removed. A total of 263 (11.01%) surveys were returned with responses, forty-seven respondents (17.87%) indicated that they use the pedestrian overcrossing, while 218 respondents (82.13%) indicated that they do not use the pedestrian overcrossing. Forty-six surveys were returned by the Postmaster as undeliverable due to vacant or unoccupied properties.

Of the 47 (17.87%) surveys that indicated they use the pedestrian overcrossing, eight of them were returned in Spanish, while 24 of the 218 returned the survey in Spanish indicating that they do not use the pedestrian overcrossing. Of the 47 respondents who indicated that they use the pedestrian overcrossing, 25 started their trips at Pearce Street, 15 started their trips at Flagstone Place, while 7 did not specify. The users of the pedestrian overcrossing indicated that their trips occur between the hours of 6 to 10 am in the morning, and 2 to 6 pm in the evenings. Fifteen of the 42 respondents indicated their destinations were to the surrounding schools, 12 indicated their destinations were to shopping, while 16 indicated "other". When asked if they had other forms of transportation to their destination, 28 indicated "yes", while 14 indicated "no". When asked if the pedestrian overcrossing was removed, how would they get to their destination in the mornings and evenings, the respondents indicated that they would walk, drive, in both mornings and evenings. When asked if they would eliminate their trip(s) if the overcrossing was removed, 16 of the 47 indicated "yes", 24 indicated "no", while 7 did not respond. Please see Figure 2.2-2a for a summary map of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing survey results.

### **Summary of December 17, 2002 Pearce Street Public Meeting**

On December 17, 2002, approximately 50 interested parties attended the Public Meeting. The materials at the Public Meeting included visual representations of preliminary proposals for replacement of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing. There were eight proposals, including a “no build” option that would eliminate the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing. The seven “build” options included variations of where the new pedestrian was proposed. A Comment Form was available at the Public Meeting to solicit input from the attendees. The feedback provided by the attendees for the Public Meeting consisted of a variety of comments. The consideration for elimination of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing to saving a resident’s home who was potentially affected by the initiate set of proposals.

Based on input from various stakeholders, the Department elected to proceed with the build option labeled Alternative 5B (as presented in the Public Meeting), which utilizes a sliver of the existing maintenance road alongside Wintersburg Channel. The Wintersburg Channel is under the jurisdiction of the Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD). Alternative 5B utilizes the existing entrance/exit point at Flagstone Place (northside) and it proposes a new entrance/exit point at Pearce Street (southside), where the new entrance/exit point is parallel to Wintersburg Channel. Please see Figure 2.2-2b for the plan of the Pearce Street pedestrian overcrossing (Alternative 5B).

### **TRASK AVENUE/SORRELL DRIVE PUBLIC MEETING SYNOPSIS**

#### **Background**

The structures design team, when reviewing the SR-22 Project plans, identified several locations where there could be potential conflicts with the location of proposed bridge columns and existing traffic conditions, primarily in left-turn lanes. As most of the potential conflicts involved City of Garden Grove local streets, the traffic team met with the City to discuss these issues.

It was noted that the widening of the existing SR-22 overcrossing of Trask Avenue, west of Harbor Boulevard, would require additional bridge columns in the median of Trask Avenue. These additional columns in the median supporting the westerly bridge widening will extend through the intersection of Sorrell Drive. Sorrell Drive, a north-south residential street, one block long, presently forms a “T-intersection” with Trask Avenue, an east-west arterial. Extension of the existing median on Trask Avenue westerly through the intersection to protect the new columns will result in limiting access at Sorrell Drive. Access would be limited to west-bound right turns from Trask to Sorrell, and southbound right turns from Sorrell to Trask. Since widening of the overcrossing would potentially require acquisition of the residential property on the northeast corner of Trask/Sorrell, one option to limited access of right turns in and out only between Trask and Sorrell would be to cul-de-sac Sorrell Drive at Trask Avenue. Both the limited access and the cul-de-sac options would eliminate traffic that is now using this segment of Sorrell Drive between Trask Avenue and Banner Drive as an alternate from the busy intersection of Harbor Boulevard/Trask Avenue to the east.

A public meeting was held at the City of Garden Grove City Hall with the City Traffic Engineer and one of his assistants.

#### **Public Meeting**

The Public Meeting was held by the City of Garden Grove on Tuesday, October 15, 2002, 6:30 PM, in the Garden Grove Community Meeting Center, Constitution Room, 11300 Stanford Avenue, Garden Grove. As only one person was in attendance initially, the start time was delayed until about 6:45 PM to determine if others would attend; one additional person arrived. There are a couple of ways to eliminate these left turns, and that was the purpose of this meeting.

During this public meeting, the City staff noted that the process required for altering access involved three basic steps. The first step is to hold a public meeting with local residents to present the issue, present the options and obtain their concerns and input. The second step is to take the issue to the City Traffic Commission, along with the input from the initial public meeting. The Traffic Commission will make a recommendation and forward it to the City Council for final action. The City staff indicated they would conduct the traffic counts in the area and arrange for the public meeting.

In addition to the two attendees, the City Traffic Engineer and one of his assistants, one member from the City fire department, one OCTA member, and two other staff members from the Advance Planning Study were present. The Advance Planning Study members were formulated at the conclusion of the DEIR/EIS phase. Since this project is proposed to be a design-build project, this team will manage the design-build contractor. The Project Management Contract team consists of the Advance Planning Study members.

Provisions of the HOV lane and auxiliary lane in each direction require the widening of almost every bridge along SR-22, including Harbor Blvd. Where SR-22 crosses Trask Avenue near Sorrell Drive, the structure is also carrying the westbound (WB) onramp. Widening of the existing over crossing in the vicinity of the northeast (NE) corner of Trask/Sorrell varies between about 40 and 45 feet. Additional bridge columns will be needed in the median area of Trask Avenue, extending to the west of Sorrell. This leads to right-of-way acquisition of the property on the northeast (NE) corner.

The City conducted recent counts on Sorrell Drive and determined the use to be approximately 1,850 vehicles per day. This is about 10 times the volume of a local residential street. Most of this traffic is due to motorists using Sorrell Drive as an alternative route to Harbor Boulevard. Between 150-200 vehicles travel on Sorrell Drive in both the AM and PM peak hours. Examining the turning volumes, it appears the diversion between SB to WB, and EB to NB, are about even in the AM, but in the PM the primary diversion is SB to WB.

The existing median on Trask Avenue will need to be extended to the west approximately 75-100 feet which will eliminate the WB to NB left turn lanes, in turn, eliminating some of the diversion. Based on the counts, this would reduce the volumes by about 100 vehicles in the AM and 50-60 in the PM.

While a "right-turn-only" sign for SB Sorrell might be the only additional traffic control needed, a more positive traffic control measure would be to implement channelization that enforces the right-turn-out only movement. A triangular island would allow only right turns in and out Trask Avenue, with a cut-through for pedestrians.

The PTE opened the meeting for discussion and input on the issue. There were minimal comments from the two residents in attendance. One lived near the corner of Banner and mentioned it was often difficult to back out of her driveway. Both expressed support of the cul-de-sac concept. The Department and OCTA will continue coordination with the City of Garden Grove and the affected residents on the Sorrell Drive modification proposals.

#### **10.5.4 General Overview of Comments Received for DEIR/EIS**

Comments were received from various governmental agencies such as the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); County of Orange; Cities of Garden Grove, Orange, Seal Beach and Tustin; school districts; and concerned citizens from the cities along the SR-22 corridor. The comments consisted of a range of concerns for environmental impacts resulting from the project. These included air quality, noise, potential depreciation of property values, right-of-way, traffic and visual impacts. Many residents were concerned with air quality and noise impacts to sensitive receptors such as schools, while others were concerned with the loss of property value due in part to the freeway being closer to their community, the potential partial acquisitions of the six residential properties at Martha Ann Drive in Rossmoor, and visual impacts resulting from the I-405/I-605 HOV connector (flyover). Other comments received from residents in the Los

Alamitos/Community of Rossmoor included exploring the option to shift the I-405/I-605 HOV connector to west of the I-605 near the Los Alamitos Channel and the San Gabriel River.

The majority of the comments were drawn from the western portions of the project limits such as the Los Alamitos/Community of Rossmoor and the City of Seal Beach. The primary concerns of citizens in the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor area were the proposed I-405/I-605 direct HOV connector and the environmental impacts associated with it. To address these and other concerns, multiple sections of the EIR/EIS were re-analyzed to investigate ways to minimize harm. The air quality, Historic Property Survey Report/Historic Architectural Survey Report (HPSR/HASR), noise, relocation impacts, traffic and visual impact sections were reanalyzed to avoid and minimize environmental impacts to the surrounding communities along the SR-22 corridor.

The City of Seal Beach's residents were primarily concerned with the proposed displacements of six residential properties along Almond Avenue. Many had requested shifting the centerline to south of I-405 towards the United States Naval Weapons Station, leased to a private entity for use as farmlands. As of September 17, 2001, the United States Department of the Navy ceased all public access, including farming activities. This farmland was designated as prime farmland. Due to the overwhelming number of comments pertaining to the shifting of the centerline towards the United States Naval Weapons Station, the Department solicited comments from the Department of the Navy requesting permission to use this option to avoid impacts to the City of Seal Beach. Other comments also received from residents in the City of Seal Beach included exploring the option to shift the I-405/I-605 HOV connector to west of the I-605 Los Alamitos Channel and the San Gabriel River. The City of Seal Beach also sent comments regarding the SR-22/WOCC proposed project. The City hired a consultant firm to review the DEIR/EIS and it resulted in approximately 180 pages of comments.

The residents from the City of Garden Grove were primarily concerned with SR-22 freeway noise and its impacts to schoolchildren. Approximately 188 petitions were received regarding the area near Euclid Street and the need for noise barriers to reduce the noise levels at nearby elementary schools.

The comments received during the public comments period along with their responses are included in Appendix A (Volumes II and III) of this Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/EIR). The comments received after October 30, 2001 are included in Volume IV of this FEIS/EIR. The comments are broken down into four major categories: 1. September 26, 2001 Public Hearing Comments; 2. October 3, 2001 Public Hearing Comments; 3. Comments via Email; and 4. Comments via Mail. Within each category, where applicable, the comments are subcategorized into Federal, State, Local Agencies, Associations and Private Entities, Citizens, and Form Letters. The "Federal" subfolder consists of comments received from federal agencies; there were no comments received from State agencies. However, comments were received from multiple local agencies such as the County of Orange, various cities along the SR-22 corridor, and school districts. The "Association and Private Entities" consisted of homeowner's associations and utility companies. The "Citizens" category is further subdivided into geographic areas and "Other Cities." The comments in each subcategory of the "Citizens" folder are organized by the surname, followed by the first initial, and then the date of the comment or the date it was received. If a comment was received from a governmental agency, then it is organized by the name of the city, followed by the date of receipt. A table of contents including a more detailed layout of the comments and the Responses to Comments key are attached to Appendix A. The Response to Comments key precedes the comments submitted section. An index follows the comments; it categorizes all of the responses in a subject area for ease of locating a particular issues (e.g. air quality impacts).

### **10.5.5 General Overview of Coordination during the DEIR/EIS**

During the public review/comment period of the DEIR/EIS, the Department informally met with the Community of Rossmoor Homeowner Association (RHA) and various officials from the Cities along the corridor. Environmental Staff from the Department also sent numerous SR-22/WOCC project informational packages

to concern citizens from the cities of Seal Beach, Garden Grove, Community of Rossmoor, and representatives.